arXiv:1611.04949v1 [hep-ph] 15 Nov 2016

Future 100 TeV colliders' safety in the context of stable micro black holes production

A.V. Sokolov[1,2,3,*], M. S. Pshirkov[4,1,5]

[1] *Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 117312, Moscow, Russia*

[2] *Physics Department, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow 119991, Russia*

[3] *Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, B.Cheremushkinskaya 25, Moscow 117218, Russia*

[4] *Sternberg Astronomical Institute, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Universitetsky prospekt 13, 119234, Moscow, Russia*

[5] *Pushchino Radio Astronomy Observatory, 142290 Pushchino, Russia*

[*] e-mail: anton.sokolov@physics.msu.ru

Abstract

In the theories with extra dimensions the higher-dimensional Planck mass could be as small as 1 TeV, that entails the possibility that a considerable amount of microscopic black holes can be produced during runs of future high energy colliders. According to the laws of quantum theory, these black holes are supposed to evaporate immediately; however, due to the lack of the experimental data confirming this process as well as in absence of a reliable theory of quantum gravity, for the exhaustive analysis of safety one has to consider the worst case in which the micro black holes could be stable. In this paper we consider the theories with the different number of extra dimensions and deduce which of them yield Earth's accretion times smaller than the lifetime of the Solar system. We calculate the cross sections of the black hole production at the 100 TeV collider, the fraction of the black holes trapped inside the Earth and the resulting rate of production. We study the astrophysical consequences of stable micro black holes existence, in particular its influence on the stability of white dwarfs and neutron stars. Several mechanisms of the micro black hole production, which were not considered before, are taken into account. Finally, using the astrophysical constraints we derive expected number of 'dangerous' black holes from the future 100 TeV terrestrial experiments.

I. INTRODUCTION

Unsolved puzzles of fundamental physics encourage scientists to probe interactions at progressively higher energies. The Large Hadron Collider has not so far found any hints on 'new physics', so there are plans to construct even more energetic and luminous experiment. In particular, there is the High-Luminosity LHC project [1] that aims to increase the LHC luminosity by a factor of ten by 2025 and the Future Circular Collider project [2] that is supposed to reach the hadron collision energy of 100 TeV by 2035.

But firstly, it is imperative to be sure that this experiment will pose no risk to the Earth. The question of safety of the LHC was examined in detail by the LHC Safety Assessment Group (e.g. see review [3]). It was shown that the exotic dangerous kinds of matter, such as strangelets, magnetic monopoles, true vacuum bubbles and stable micro black holes, cannot be produced at the LHC, for their existence at the energies below 14 TeV strongly contradicts astrophysical observations. In this work we study safety of the future 100 TeV collider and limit our research to the danger associated with the stable micro black holes.

Microscopic black holes with the masses under 100 TeV appear in the extra-dimensional theories [4–6]. In these theories the value of the higher-dimensional Panck mass can be as low as several TeV. Existing constraints on the parameters of the models with extra dimensions come from the direct measurements of Newton's law of gravitation at small distances [7, 8] and from the LHC searches [9, 10] for the missing transverse energy of jets due to graviton-emission processes: the radii of the extra dimensions $R_D < 37$ μm and the Planck mass $M_D > 3.5$ TeV. In this work we will conservatively assume $M_D > 3$ TeV. The minimum black hole mass corresponding to the certain M_D can be found from the condition that the entropy of the black hole be large (see [11]). In the case of six dimensions the black hole mass $M = 5M_D$ corresponds to the entropy $S_{BH} \simeq 24$ and we will take it as the lower threshold of mass. Besides, in this work we assume there is no Hawking radiation [12]. This worst scenario must be taken into account due to the lack of the experimental data concerning the Hawking radiation as well as due to the theoretical uncertainties in the field of quantum gravity. In particular, there are theoretical suggestions [13, 14] that the process of Hawking radiation could depend on the details of the Planck-scale degrees of freedom. There is also the question if the produced black holes, which in general have non-zero charge, lose their charge immediately via the Schwinger mechanism [15] or they

remain charged. Hypothetically, in the worst case, the Schwinger discharge can happen even if there is no Hawking radiation (see the discussion in [16]), so we have to consider the neutral stable micro black holes as well as the charged ones.

In our work we refer often to the methods proposed by the authors of the study [16] of safety of the LHC in the context of the stable micro black holes production. However, we propose a more correct method of the calculation of the number of the black holes trapped inside the Earth during the work of high energy collider. Besides, we examine some astrophysical mechanisms of micro black hole production, that were not considered in [16] and that provide conservative model-independent constraints.

II. ACCRETION TIMES

Let us consider the D-dimensional gravitational action with a general compact metric $g_{mn}(y)$ and the warp factor A:

$$S = \frac{1}{8\pi G_D} \int d^D x \sqrt{-g} \cdot \frac{1}{2} R, \tag{1}$$

$$ds^2 = e^{2A(y)} dx^\mu dx_\mu + g_{mn}(y) dy^m dy^n, \tag{2}$$

where x^μ are usual non-compact Minkowski coordinates. The characteristic radius R_D of the extra dimensions is connected with the Planck mass M_D as following:

$$\frac{M_4^2}{M_D^2} \simeq (R_D M_D)^{D-4} \cdot e^{2\Delta A}, \tag{3}$$

where $M_4 = 2.4 \cdot 10^{15}$ TeV, ΔA is the difference in warping between the region with maximum warp factor and the standard model region. In case $D = 5$ and zero warping the Planck mass $M_D \sim 10$ TeV gives the value $R_D \sim 10^7$ km, that is obviously excluded. In the theories with large number of extra dimensions R_D decreases with increasing D and $R_6 \sim 5\,\mu m$ is already smaller than the existing constraint on R_D ($R_D < 37$ μm).

In order to claim that some specific scenario could be dangerous for the Earth we have to calculate the time which the black hole needs in order to grow to the macroscopic size. The accretion of the stable micro black holes was in detail studied in [16]. It was shown that the accretion goes through three different phases: subnuclear, subatomic and macroscopic. For large number of extra dimensions we will conservatively neglect the subnuclear phase (we want to find the lower constraint on the black hole accretion time), for $D = 5$ or 6 the

initial (black hole mass $M_{BH} \sim M_D$) capture radius in matter is larger than the nucleus scale (e.g. for $D = 6$ capture radius $R_{EM} \sim 10^{-12}$ cm), so there is no subnuclear phase. The four-dimensional accretion is much slower than the higher-dimensional one due to the huge value of M_4, that is why the smaller values of R_D cause larger accretion times (because the transition to the four-dimensional gravity occurs earlier). Thus, the most conservative case with the fastest evolution is the case where there is no warping ($\Delta A = 0$), apart from the theory with $D = 5$ where the warping is crucial and we set the warp factor the way that R_5 is maximal and equal to $37\,\mu$m.

The constraints on the times of the accretion inside the Earth for theories with $D = 5-11$ are presented in Table I. The capture radius of the phase of macroscopic (Bondi) accretion is Bondi radius R_B, the radius R_C denotes the distance of crossover, where the higher-dimensional gravity force equals the four-dimensional one. The accretion times depend on the properties of the components of the Earth. The authors in [16] parametrize this dependence by the Debye temperature T_{Deb} (that is about 400 K for the materials typical for Earth's composition) and the other parameters $\chi \simeq 1$ and λ_D ($4 \leqslant \lambda_4 < 18, \quad 3 < \lambda_D < 6.6$). We see that in the theories with more than six dimensions the accretion times are longer than the lifetime of the Solar system. In the cases of 5 and 6 dimensions we get accretion times $t \gtrsim 10^5 - 10^6$ yr, which are not large from the geological point of view, though the case $D = 5$ requires a theory with the special choice of warping:

$$19 - 1.5 \ln \frac{M_5}{M_0} < \Delta A < 24 - 1.5 \ln \frac{M_5}{M_0}, \tag{4}$$

where $M_0 = 1$ TeV and the limits are given by the experimental constraint on the maximum R_D and the condition that the accretion time is shorter than the Solar system lifetime. The results for both 5 and 6 dimensions are similar, and, bearing in mind that the theory with $D = 5$ requires an extreme fine-tuning, we limit our research to the case $D = 6$. The full time of the black hole growth inside the Earth in this case is shown in Fig. 1.

Phases	Subatomic	Macroscopic		
		$a \lesssim R_B \lesssim R_D$	$R_D \lesssim R_B \lesssim R_C$	$R_B > R_C$
$D = 5$, $\Delta A \sim f(M_5)$	$t \gtrsim 2.3 \cdot 10^{-5} \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi} m_5^3$ s	$t \lesssim 3.6 \cdot 10^{-2} \frac{1}{\lambda_5} m_5^3$ s	$t > 3 \cdot 10^5$ yr	$t \sim 3 \cdot 10^5$ yr
$D = 6$	$t \gtrsim 4.5 \cdot 10^3 \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi} m_6^4$ s	$t = 5.5 \cdot 10^4 \frac{1}{\lambda_6} m_6^2$ yr	$t = 2.4 \cdot 10^5 \frac{1}{\lambda_6} m_6^2$ yr	$t = 9.7 \cdot 10^4 \frac{1}{\lambda_4} m_6^2$ yr
$D = 7$	$t \gtrsim 3.0 \cdot 10^{11} \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi} m_7^5$ s	$t = 8.6 \cdot 10^8 \frac{1}{\lambda_7} m_7^{5/3}$ yr	$t = 9.1 \cdot 10^9 \frac{1}{\lambda_7} m_7^{5/3}$ yr	$t = 1.3 \cdot 10^{10} \frac{1}{\lambda_4} m_7^{5/3}$ yr
$D = 8$	$t \gtrsim 5.4 \cdot 10^6 \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi} m_8^{-3/2}$ yr $+t'$	$t = 1.2 \cdot 10^{12} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_4}$ yr $\quad (a < R_B < 2a)$		
$D = 9$	$t \gtrsim 2.0 \cdot 10^4 \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi} m_9^{-7/5}$ yr $+t'$			
$D = 10$	$t \gtrsim 2.2 \cdot 10^2 \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi} m_{10}^{-4/3}$ yr $+t'$			
$D = 11$	$t \gtrsim 4.8 \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi} m_{11}^{-9/7}$ yr $+t'$			

$f(M_5) = 19 - 1.5 \ln m_5$, $t' = 3.1 \cdot 10^{11} \cdot \frac{T_4^2}{\chi}$ yr, $m_D = M_D/M_0$, $M_0 = 1$ TeV, $T_4 = T_{Deb}/400$ K, $a = 1$ Å,
$\chi \simeq 1$, $4 \leqslant \lambda_4 < 18$, $3 < \lambda_D < 6.6$, ΔA – warp factor

TABLE I. Accretion times of the stable micro black holes in the Earth divided into subatomic (capture radius smaller than a =1 Å) and macroscopic phases. Macroscopic phase is divided into three, division governed by radius of extra dimensions R_D and crossover radius R_C. The last phase corresponds to the growth from R_C to the size compatible with the radius of the Earth.



FIG. 1. Lower bound on the Earth destruction time in the theories with D=6 dimensions and the dangerous values of Planck mass from 3 to 20 TeV

III. BLACK HOLES IN THE EARTH

The cross section of the black hole production in pp collisions at the energy of 100 TeV according to the factorization theorem [17] is:

$$\sigma_{BH}(M > M_{min}) = \sum_{ij} \int_{\tau_{min}}^{1} d\tau \int_{\tau}^{1} \frac{dx}{x} f_i(x) f_j(\tau/x) \sigma'(\sqrt{s'}), \tag{5}$$

where $f_i(x)$ – parton distribution functions (we use the set CT14qed [18]), $\tau_{min} = \frac{M_{min}^2}{y^2 s}$, $M_{min} = 5M_6$, $\tau = x_1 x_2$, $s' = s \cdot \tau$, $y \simeq 0.5 - 0.7$ – inelasticity factor (see [19]). The double sum implies the summation over the all pairs of partons. The cross section for the collision of two partons is:

$$\sigma'(\sqrt{s'}) = \pi R^2(\sqrt{\tau s}), \quad R(\sqrt{\tau s}) = \frac{1}{M_6} \cdot \left(\frac{3\sqrt{\tau s}}{4M_6} \right)^{1/3}, \tag{6}$$

R is the Schwarzshild radius. The parton distribution functions should be taken at the scale $Q \sim 1/R$, as it is discussed in [11]. The number of the black holes produced at the future 100 Tev collider (center of mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 100$ TeV, PDF scale $Q \sim 10$ TeV, integrated luminosity $L \sim 10^4$ fb^{-1}) is plotted as a function of M_6 in Fig. 2.



FIG. 2. The number of black holes produced during the lifetime of the future 100 TeV collider with integrated luminosity $L = 10^4$ fb^{-1} in the theories with D=6 dimensions, Planck masses 3 − 15 TeV and for two values of inelasticity parameter $y = 0.5$ and $y = 0.7$

BHs on average will be produced with velocities much larger than escape velocity, thus only a tiny fraction of them will be trapped inside the Earth. In order to calculate this fraction we need the distribution of not only the longitudinal momenta of partons, given

by the standard parton distribution functions, but also of the transverse momenta, that is why we use the transverse momentum dependent parton distribution functions (TMDPDF) $g_i(x,k)$ from the library tmdlib-1.0.7 [20]. According to the TMD factorization [21], the cross section of the BH production (mass larger than M, longitudinal momentum less than p and transverse momentum less than k) is given by:

$$\sigma_{BH}(M,p,k) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{ij}\int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha \int\limits_{R(p,k,\alpha)} dk_1 dk_2 dx_1 dx_2 \cdot g_i(x_1,k_1) g_j(x_2,k_2)\sigma(x_1,x_2), \tag{7}$$

$$\sigma(x_1,x_2) = \frac{\pi}{M_6^2}\cdot\left(\frac{3\sqrt{x_1 x_2 s}}{4M_6}\right)^{2/3}, \tag{8}$$

$$R(p,k,\alpha) = \left\{\frac{M}{\sqrt{s}} \le x_1, x_2 \le 1,\ \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2}|x_1 - x_2| \le p,\ \sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2 + 2k_1 k_2 \cos\alpha} \le k\right\}. \tag{9}$$

At the present moment we will assume that the black holes are neutral. Neutral black holes will slow down inside the Earth due to the accretion and gravitational scattering. This process was in detail studied in [16], where the maximum speed for a black hole to be still trapped inside the Earth was calculated. In our case ($D = 6$):

$$v_{max} = 11.2\cdot 10^{-3}\cdot\frac{l}{d}\left(\frac{M_0}{M_6}\right)^{8/3}\left(\frac{M_0}{M}\right)^{1/3}, \tag{10}$$

where l is the path length of the black hole inside the Earth, d is the mean diameter of the Earth, $M_0 = 1$ TeV. This velocity is usually much larger than the escape velocity. Note that l/d equals v_r/v, the ratio of the radial (directed to the center of the Earth) speed to the total speed of the black hole; $v_r = (k/M)\cos\phi$, where ϕ is the angle between the direction to the center of the Earth and the transverse momentum, $-\pi/2 < \phi < \pi/2$, the velocities are non-relativistic. Then the condition for the black hole to be trapped reads as:

$$v < v_{max} \Rightarrow p^2 + k^2 < 11.2\cdot 10^{-3}\left(\frac{M_0}{M_6}\right)^{8/3}\left(\frac{M_0}{M}\right)^{1/3} kM\cos\phi. \tag{11}$$

Thus, the fraction of the black holes that will be trapped (suppression factor) is given by:

$$s(M_6) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_{tot}(M_6)}\int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} d\phi \int\limits_{D(M_6,\phi)} \left|\frac{d^3\sigma_{BH}(M_6)}{dpdkdM}\right| dpdkdM, \tag{12}$$

where the region $D(M_6,\phi)$ is given by the inequality (11) and the total cross section $\sigma_{tot}(M_6)$ – by the Eq. (5). The values of the suppression factor are presented in Fig. 3 and the number



FIG. 3. The fraction of the neutral black holes produced at the future 100 TeV collider which are trapped inside the Earth (theories with 6 dimensions)



FIG. 4. The amount of neutral black holes trapped inside the Earth during the lifetime of the future 100 TeV collider (integrated luminosity $L = 10^4$ fb^{-1}) with the suppression factor Eq. (12) taken into account and for two values of inelasticity $y = 0.5$ and $y = 0.7$

of the black holes trapped inside the Earth for the integrated luminosity $L = 10^4$ fb^{-1} is plotted in Fig. 4.

It is worth noting that the calculation of the suppression factor in Ref. [16] was considerably simplified: the authors assumed that all the black holes which were produced had the same lowest possible mass M_{min} and that their transverse momenta are identical. These assumptions lead to the underestimated value of the suppression factor, because the maximum initial momentum for a black hole to be still trapped inside the Earth $p_{max} = Mv_{max} \propto M^{2/3}$ and, setting $M = M_{min}$, one gets the underestimated value of this momentum for the black holes with $M > M_{min}$, so not all the trapped black holes are taken into account.

IV. ASTROPHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS

If the stable micro black holes could be produced at the colliders, they would be as well naturally produced in the Universe by the high energy cosmic rays. This can contradict the observed long lifetimes of the dense astrophysical objects, in which these black holes can get stuck and accrete. First of all, we would like to consider the stopping power of different astrophysical objects. The theory of the deceleration of the microscopic black holes inside celestial bodies was developed in [16]. It was calculated that the Earth has not sufficient power to stop neither stable nor charged (with masses more than 7 TeV) relativistic micro

black holes (we consider the black holes produced in the collisions of the high energy cosmic rays with some slow objects), while the Sun can stop the charged relativistic black holes with masses well in excess of 100 TeV and cannot stop the neutral relativistic black holes. Finally, the general expression for the minimum column density required to stop the neutral micro black hole with mass M was derived. In our case ($D = 6$) this required column density is:

$$\delta_{min} = 0.27 \cdot \left(\frac{M_6}{M_0}\right)^3 \left(\frac{\gamma_i M}{M_6}\right)^{1/3} M_0^3, \tag{13}$$

where $M_0^3 = 4.6 \cdot 10^{12}$ g/cm^2, γ_i – the initial Lorentz factor of the black hole. Consider the cosmic ray nucleus with atomic number A and high energy E hitting the target nucleon. The initial energy of the produced black hole $\gamma_i M = yxE/A$ (y – inelasticity, x – the fraction of the nucleon centre of mass momentum carried by the incident parton). Then the condition for the column density δ required to stop the black hole is:

$$\delta > \delta_{min} \Rightarrow xE < \left(\frac{\delta}{0.27 M_0^3}\right)^3 \left(\frac{M_0}{M_6}\right)^9 \cdot M_6 \cdot \frac{A}{y}. \tag{14}$$

The column density along the diameter of a white dwarf with a mass $M_{WD} = 1.2 M_\odot$ is $\delta_{WD} = 3.8 \cdot 10^{16}$ g/cm^2 (see [16]), the same value for the neutron star is $\delta_{NS} \sim 10^{20}$ g/cm^2. Due to the Eq. (14), the neutron star can stop all the black holes going through it (E is limited from above by around 10^8 TeV and the stopping condition can never be violated), while the white dwarf can stop only a small fraction of them.

There are several mechanisms that could provide the significant fluxes of the micro black holes. The most efficient mechanism is the collision of the high energy cosmic rays with the surfaces of dense stars. However, considering this mechanism, one has to account for the large magnetic fields of these stars, which can lead to the considerable synchrotron energy losses of the cosmic rays. This question was considered by [16] (see Appendix G there). It was shown that the magnetic screening prevents the cosmic rays with the energies more than E_{max} from reaching the surface,

$$E_{max} \simeq 1.8 \cdot 10^{17}\text{eV} \cdot \frac{A^4}{Z^4} \frac{10\text{km}}{R} \left(\frac{10^8\text{G}}{B \sin\theta}\right)^2, \tag{15}$$

where Z is the charge of the cosmic ray nucleus, R is the star's radius, and θ is the angle between the momentum of the cosmic ray and the magnetic axis of the star. This is not important for the case of the white dwarfs with polar magnetic field $B \sim 10^5$ G ($E_{max} \gtrsim$

10^{20} eV), but plays an important role for the case of neutron stars, for which the smallest detected magnetic field is $B \simeq 7 \cdot 10^7$ G [22].

The flux of the micro black holes produced by the cosmic rays hitting the white dwarf surface is:

$$\phi_{BH} = b \int\limits_{E_{min}}^{E_{max}} A(E) J(E) dE \sum_{ij} \int\limits_{\tau_{min}}^{1} d\tau \int\limits_{\tau}^{1} \frac{dx}{x} f_i(x) f_j(\tau/x) \sigma'(\sqrt{s'}), \tag{16}$$

where $b = 1/\sigma_{NN}$, $\sigma_{NN} = 100$ mb – total nucleon-nucleon inelastic cross section, $E_{min} = \min[M_{min}^2 A/(2m_p y^2)] = 7 \cdot 10^5$ TeV, $E_{max} = 2 \cdot 10^8$ TeV, $y = \max[0.5,\ M_{min}/100\ \text{TeV}]$ (most conservative case, corresponding to the minimum production at the 100 TeV collider), $\tau_{min} = M_{min}^2 A/(2m_p y^2 E)$, $J(E)$ – the combined energy spectrum of cosmic rays as measured by the Auger Observatory, fitted with a flux model (see [23]). The dependence of the mean atomic number A on the energy E is taken also from [23] (we interpolated Auger data and averaged over the two hadronic interaction models EPOS-LHC and QGSJetII-04), however in the case of the white dwarf the resulting bounds weakly depend on the cosmic ray composition: the black hole production at the given energy decreases with increasing A, but also the condition (14) becomes less constraining and allows higher energies to be involved.

The total number of the black holes, produced on a surface of a white dwarf of radius R during the time t, is $N_{BH} = 4\pi R^2 \Omega t \cdot \phi_{BH}$, where the solid angle $\Omega = 2\pi$. In order to calculate the whole number of the black holes captured during the lifetime of the white dwarf, we have to limit the region of the integration in the Eq. (16) by the condition (14) and account for a decrease of the column density δ for non-zero values of the angle of incidence of the cosmic ray α. The latter is made using the dependence $\delta(\alpha)$ (Fig. 1 from [16]). The overwhelming majority of the trapped black holes is given by the small α, so we conservatively take $\delta = 0.8\delta_{WD}$ (decreasing the value of $0.9\delta_{WD}$ by 10% due to the possible systematic error, see [16]), $1 - \cos\alpha < 0.01$. The calculated number of the black holes stopped ($t = 10^9$ yr, $R = 5600$ km) is plotted as a function of M_6 in Fig. 5, for the Auger data $A(E)$ and for the 100%, 50%, 10% proton composition of the cosmic rays. The calculation that uses Auger data on the composition sets the lower bound on the number of the black holes, because cosmic rays with the small atomic number A (e.g. protons) give the main contribution to the black hole production, while increasing A (till $A = 56$ of iron) yields the number of black holes by orders of magnitude smaller. Thus, considering the mean value of A, we get the conservative estimates of the production. One can see that



FIG. 5. The amount of neutral black holes, stopped by a white dwarf with radius 5600 km during 10^9 yr for the different cosmic ray composition: 100% p, 50% p, 10% p and corresponding to Auger data on mean atomic number



FIG. 6. The amount of neutral black holes, stopped by a neutron star with radius 10 km during 10^{10} yr, cosmic ray energy $E < 5 \cdot 10^{19}$ eV, for the different cosmic ray composition: 100% p, 50% p, 10% p

in the theories with $M_6 < 7.35$ TeV there is at least one black hole that is stopped by the white dwarf. One can see also that, due to the stopping condition, this constraint on M_6 would not improve significantly, even if we knew the precise cosmic ray composition. The composition that yields the biggest number of the black holes trapped (the most optimistic scenario) is 100% p and it gives only $M_6 < 7.47$ TeV.

Now let us consider the neutron star. For the high energy cosmic rays cannot reach its surface due to the magnetic screening, we examine the other, less effective mechanisms of the black hole production:

- the production on the baryons during the lifetime of the Universe. We conservatively assume that the cosmic ray flux is the same till the redshift $z = 1$ (in reality it is supposed to increase with redshift). We also do not take into account the processes in the early Universe, which are quite model-dependent, considering redshifts from $z = 1$ till $z = 0$. The flux of the black holes can be obtained from Eq. (16), substituting parameter b for the following value:

$$b = \int_1^0 n(z)dt(z) = \int_0^1 n_0(1+z)^3 \frac{dz}{H_0(1+z)\sqrt{\Omega_M(1+z)^3+\Omega_\Lambda}} = \int_0^1 \frac{n_0(1+z)^2 dz}{H_0\sqrt{\Omega_M(1+z)^3+\Omega_\Lambda}}, \tag{17}$$

where $n_0 = 2 \cdot 10^{-7}$ cm^{-3} is the current baryon density, $H_0 = 68 \cdot \frac{\text{km/s}}{\text{Mpc}}$ is the Hubble constant, $\Omega_M = 0.31$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.69$ (see [24]). In order to obtain the reliable constraints, we set $E_{max} = 5 \cdot 10^{19}$ eV in Eq. (16), considering cosmic rays with the energies below

the Greisen-Zatsepin-Kuzmin(GZK) limit[25, 26]. For these energies the energy loss length for protons is more than 1 Gpc. We have also checked that explicit account for non-uniform distribution of extragalactic baryons [27] very weakly affects our estimate. Eq. (17) gives the value $b = 4.6 \cdot 10^{21}$ cm^{-2}.

- the production in binary systems of the neutron star and the red giant: cosmic rays hit the giant and produce the black holes which then impinge on the neutron star (we remind you that in the case of neutron star we consider the neutral black holes, so they are not affected by the magnetic field); $b = 1/\sigma_{NN} = 10^{25}$ cm^{-2}, however $t \equiv$ 'full coverage equivalent' $\lesssim 30$ Myr (see [16], Appendix H),

- the production on the interstellar medium ($b = n_H$, where $n_H \sim 10^{21}$ cm^{-2} – average column density of the hydrogen in the galaxy).

- the production on the Central Molecular Zone of our Galaxy [28], for which $b = nL = 6 \cdot 10^{22}$ cm^{-2}, however by now one has observed no long-lived neutron stars in this zone (typical ages are $t = 10^4 - 10^5$ yr).

The first three mechanisms give the comparable fluxes of the black holes (the second 6.5 times higher than the first, the first 4.6 times higher than the third), the fourth mechanism gives 4-5 orders of magnitude less (however, the last mechanism will be the most constraining, if the millisecond pulsars will be detected in the Central Molecular Zone). We use the first mechanism for our estimates, because the second one is more model-dependent and yields large systematic errors. The number of the black holes stopped by the neutron star ($t = 10^{10}$ yr, $R = 10$ km) is plotted as a function of M_6 in Fig. 6 in case of the different fractions of protons in the cosmic rays. The maximum M_6, that leads to more than one black hole stopped, is 4.88 TeV for 10% proton composition, 5.87 TeV for 50% proton composition and 6.34 TeV in case of 100% proton composition. In this calculation we limit the energy of the cosmic rays from above by $5 \cdot 10^{19}$ eV, so the most optimistic case of 100% p composition is quite possible. Worse result, with the maximum M_6 around 4 TeV, is given by the mechanism of the cosmic rays (we take $A/Z \sim 2$) hitting the surface of the neutron star with the minimum magnetic field $B = 7 \cdot 10^7$ G. The energy of the cosmic rays in this case is smaller than $5.9 \cdot 10^6$ TeV due to the condition (15); this energy is not sufficient for the production of the black holes with large masses. The magnetic field can be neglected

at the poles, however at the high energies the surface area that can be reached there is too small and the flux is less than in the case of the mechanisms studied above. In general, one can see that the constraints on M_6 are worse in case of the neutron stars than in the case of the white dwarfs. However, the future detection of the old neutron stars in the Central Molecular Zone and the data on the composition of the cosmic rays can improve the existing constraints from the neutron stars and make them the most robust.

Till now we considered the neutral black holes. The charged black holes will be stopped in the white dwarf for the whole range of energies due to the electromagnetic interactions. In order to get the number of the black holes stopped during the lifetime of a white dwarf, we have to do the same calculations, as in case of the neutral black holes, however ignoring the inequality (14). For 100% proton composition of the cosmic rays the number of the stopped black holes exceeds 10^5 till the Planck masses of 20 TeV, so the theories without the mechanism of Schwinger discharge yield more than one black hole trapped in the white dwarf during its lifetime, if there is at least 10^{-5} fraction of protons in the cosmic rays below GZK-limit. This fraction is very likely to be confirmed by the future experiments on the composition of the cosmic rays.

It was shown in [16] that the micro black hole will accrete the neutron star very fast relative to the lifetimes of the known neutron stars (in our case accretion time $t_{acc} \lesssim 5.3 \cdot (M_6/M_0)^2$ min$<$ 1.5 days). The white dwarf in our case will be destroyed in $t = 10^2 \cdot (M_6/M_0)^2$ yr $< 4 \cdot 10^4$ yr, that is also negligible in comparison with the observed lifetimes of the white dwarfs. Thus, the astrophysical observations constrain the theories in question and forbid the production of the charged stable micro black holes (in case of at least 10^{-5} proton composition of the cosmic rays below GZK-limit and any possible dangerous Planck mass) and the production of the neutral stable micro black holes in the theories with Planck mass smaller than 7.35 TeV at the 100 TeV collider.

One has to mention that the robust astrophysical constraints hypothetically can be obtained from the mechanism of high energy neutrinos hitting the surface of the neutron star, see [16] (Appendix E.3). However, there is no experimental evidence of the existence of such high energy ($E > 10^5$ TeV) neutrino flux, as well as we do not know exactly how the neutrinos behave in large magnetic fields. The future advances in neutrino physics can improve the situation.



FIG. 7. The constraint from white dwarfs on the number of neutral black holes, trapped inside the Earth

V. CONCLUSION

In this article we have examined the safety of proposed 100 TeV colliders in the context of the production of stable micro black holes in models with extra dimensions. The models with more than 6 dimensions even in the worst case scenario yield Earth's accretion times larger than the lifetime of the Solar system. A theory with five dimensions could be consistent with existing experimental constraints on the size of extra dimensions and yield in the worst case scenario accretion times smaller than the lifetime of the Solar system only with fine-tuning of the warp-factor, given by the inequalities (4). Thus, the study of the accretion times allowed us to limit our further research with the similar cases of 5 and 6 dimensions with the preference to the case of 6 dimensions. The calculation of the number of the neutral black holes trapped inside the Earth for the integrated luminosity $L = 10^4$ fb^{-1} of the future 100 TeV collider and the astrophysical constraints from the observational data on the lifetime of the white dwarfs suggest that the risks from the neutral micro black holes are tiny. Indeed, as it is shown in Fig. 7, astrophysical bounds on the Planck mass predict that the number of the trapped neutral black holes should be less than 1 (more precisely, the probability that at least one black hole will be trapped inside the Earth during the whole time of the exploitation of the collider is less than 16%). Taking into consideration all the peculiarities of the theory required (the absence of the Hawking radiation while the presence of the Schwinger discharge, see also [29]) and the needed fine-tuning of the Planck mass ($M_6 \sim 7.4 - 9.0$ TeV), we see that there is practically no danger. The constraints can

be improved via observation of the long-lived neutron stars in the Central Molecular Zone and clarification of the cosmic ray composition below GZK-limit. The clarification of the value of the proton fraction in the cosmic rays below GZK-limit will also make a robust constraint on the charged micro black holes: in case this fraction is larger than 10^{-5} there is definitely no risk from these black holes at the 100 TeV collider. More than that, the first years of exploitation of 100 TeV collider (while the integrated luminosity is still small) will strengthen the constraints on the value of the Planck mass. Needless to say, any slightly less ambitious projects, such as, e.g. the Future Super Proton-Proton Collider [30] with the energy 70 TeV and the integrated luminosity 30 ab^{-1}, will pose no danger but will greatly improve the constraints on the parameters of the extra-dimensional theories.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank S. Troitsky and I. Tkachev for numerous valuable discussions and comments on the manuscript. The question of the safety of a future collider, in its relation to cosmic-ray studies, was asked by J.-R. Cudell at the Solvay meeting "Facing the scalar sector". The work of the authors was supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant 14-12-01340. This research has made use of NASA's Astrophysics Data System.

---

[1] http://home.cern/topics/high-luminosity-lhc.

[2] https://fcc.web.cern.ch/Pages/default.aspx.

[3] J. R. Ellis, G. Giudice, M. L. Mangano, I. Tkachev, and U. Wiedemann, J. Phys. **G35**, 115004 (2008), arXiv:0806.3414 [hep-ph].

[4] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. **B429**, 263 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9803315 [hep-ph].

[5] I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. **B436**, 257 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9804398 [hep-ph].

[6] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9905221 [hep-ph].

[7] E. G. Adelberger, J. H. Gundlach, B. R. Heckel, S. Hoedl, and S. Schlamminger, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **62**, 102 (2009).

[8] J. Murata and S. Tanaka, Class. Quant. Grav. **32**, 033001 (2015), arXiv:1408.3588 [hep-ex].

[9] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS), Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 235 (2015), arXiv:1408.3583 [hep-ex].

[10] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS), Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 299 (2015), [Erratum: Eur. Phys. J.C75,no.9,408(2015)], arXiv:1502.01518 [hep-ex].

[11] S. B. Giddings and S. D. Thomas, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 056010 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0106219 [hep-ph].

[12] S. W. Hawking, *In *Gibbons, G.W. (ed.), Hawking, S.W. (ed.): Euclidean quantum gravity* 167-188*, Commun. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975), [,167(1975)].

[13] W. G. Unruh and R. Schutzhold, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 024028 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0408009 [gr-qc].

[14] G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B638**, 523 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0511184 [hep-th].

[15] J. S. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **82**, 664 (1951).

[16] S. B. Giddings and M. L. Mangano, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 035009 (2008), arXiv:0806.3381 [hep-ph].

[17] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. F. Sterman, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. **5**, 1 (1989), arXiv:hep-ph/0409313 [hep-ph].

[18] C. Schmidt, J. Pumplin, D. Stump, and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 114015 (2016), arXiv:1509.02905 [hep-ph].

[19] D. M. Eardley and S. B. Giddings, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 044011 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0201034 [gr-qc].

[20] F. Hautmann, H. Jung, M. Krämer, P. J. Mulders, E. R. Nocera, T. C. Rogers, and A. Signori, Eur. Phys. J. **C74**, 3220 (2014), arXiv:1408.3015 [hep-ph].

[21] T. C. Rogers, Eur. Phys. J. **A52**, 153 (2016), arXiv:1509.04766 [hep-ph].

[22] R. N. Manchester, G. B. Hobbs, A. Teoh, and M. Hobbs, Astron. J. **129**, 1993 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0412641 [astro-ph].

[23] *The Pierre Auger Observatory: Contributions to the 34th International Cosmic Ray Conference (ICRC 2015)* (2015) arXiv:1509.03732 [astro-ph.HE].

[24] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), A&A **A13**, 594 (2015), arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].

[25] K. Greisen, Physical Review Letters **16**, 748 (1966).

[26] G. T. Zatsepin and V. A. Kuz'min, Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics Letters **4**, 78 (1966).

[27] H. Bi and A. F. Davidsen, ApJ **479**, 523 (1997), astro-ph/9611062.

[28] M. Morris and E. Serabyn, ARA&A **34**, 645 (1996).

[29] R. Torres, F. Fayos, and O. Lorente-Espín, *Proceedings, 13th Marcel Grossmann Meeting on Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Astrophysics, and Relativistic Field Theories (MG13): Stockholm, Sweden, July 1-7, 2012*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D22**, 1350086 (2013), arXiv:1309.6358 [gr-qc].

[30] J. Tang *et al.*, (2015), arXiv:1507.03224 [physics.acc-ph].